The Reformed Journal

lume 3 — No. 8 | A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion | August, 1953

One Thought on Leaving Holland

AMERICANS in Europe get ideas. New ideas about new lands and peoples. Remodeled ideas about things back home. And always there is the dangerous temptation to share these ideas with those back home. Dangerous because such a sharing of ideas usually involves comparisons and comparisons frequently make no one happy. Although there is perhaps no kind of writing more dangerous than that which registers the reflections of a traveler on the land of his travels, after a brief year in Amsterdam I succumb to the temptation to share at least one idea that has gotten firmly lodged in my mind. The conviction that self-examination is better than self-praise, and critical self-reflection better than pretty eulogies, enables me to flaunt the attending dangers.

Pan-Americanism

THE German has frequently been criticized for living by the slogan, *Deutschland ueber Alles.* Rightly so. But strangely so by those who themselves live by the principle of Pan-Americanism and My Country Right or Wrong. The American abroad is likely to have his Pan-Americanism reinforced. Usually he can stay abroad but a short time. Pressed by time he hurries through Europe, or as the European smilingly quotes him as saying, "he does Europe" in a few weeks with a traveler's guide in one hand, a camera in the other, and pockets filled with souvenirs. He sees what his camera sees, the body but not the soul, the surface but not the spirit beneath. Comparing what he sees with what first strikes the eye in the American scene, he quickly concludes that back home everything is better. The surface at home is smoother and brighter. Our plumbing is better, our colors more colorful, our clothes better tailored, and our automobiles more powerful and roomier than the toy-like European car which would spell sure death for the rider in an American-size accident. The fast traveling American abroad becomes a Texan in spirit. Most things in Europe seem small, except the churches and the Alps, and everything is old. His eye, like his all seeing and omnipresent Kodak, fails to detect that mellowness and ripeness of spirit that frequently accompanies old age and is never found without it. Unavoidably he comes to the conclusion that *Bei uns ist alles viel besser, viel grosser* — a conclusion that the European senses without enthusiasm, and frequently with a bit of kindly, paternalistic contempt.

At home everything is better. This too was my early impression, an impression I sought to keep private, but it did lead me to look frequently and lovingly at my little green passport. But after a while this sense of superiority began to wear thin. In my value-judgments, the scales began to level off. The conviction began to emerge that some things in Europe are better, and I noticed that frequently these better things were of greater value than refrigeration and television. The desire began to grow that some of these things could be taken back home as easily as one takes home a bust of Beethoven, or a book of Rembrandt prints. But it is as difficult to take them home as it would be easy to get them through customs. One thing that I should like to export is the Hollander's recognition of, and respect for, distinction of func-

IN THIS ISSUE

One Thought on Leaving Holland ..... *James Daane* 1
Dawn and Sunset of Modern Missions .. *Harry R. Boer* 5
Advisory Committees at Our Synod ... *John Gritter* 8
The Radicalism of Thomas Muenzer .... Simon J. De Vries 11
A Program for Christian Social Action 14
Letters to the Journal 15

One Thought on Leaving Holland — Continued

tion, and the freedom that grows within such recognition and respect.

Recognition of Distinctive Functions

THE idea that men are created equal is hardly an unknown idea in Europe. But the European is less inclined than the American to confuse equality before law with equality of function. He knows that the political equality that comes with birth is not an achievement, but that skill of function is the product of human effort and the result of training. The individual who has acquired the skill of a particular function by dint of toil and training should be recognized for what he is: someone who is able to do something better than someone else who has not been trained for this function. Unlike the average American, the European does not believe that because everybody is created equal, everybody can do anything as well as anybody else. This leads to the granting of diplomas in all but the most unskilled areas of human labor. This accounts for the fact that in many churches one need not apply for a position in the music department unless one can exhibit a diploma in the field of music. It also accounts for the fact that one cannot advertize his services in bicycle repairing, or anything like it, without being able to claim ownership of a diploma in the area in which he desires to sell his services. He must be able to serve, before he can sell service.

This insistence upon skilled training and this respect for skills attained, lends an air of professionalism to many forms of labor which the American never associates with the word profession. But from this stems a respect for the skills of others and a pride in one's own profession. I have frequently seen in Europe, what I have rarely seen in America, a teacher who was proud of his teaching profession. And I have heard what I never heard in America, teachers happily assert that they were well-paid and proud of their salaries. And this happy situation is possible because the public recognizes and respects distinctions of function. A Dutch parent will rarely try to teach the teacher how to teach school. It is assumed that a teacher knows how to teach, but not less that a non-teacher does not.

This insistence upon trained skill and recognition of distinctive functions introduces a rigidity into European life that an American finds irksome and regards as an infringement upon his personal liberty and freedom. Unlike the American, the European cannot go from one business to another every year or two. The necessity of the diploma stands in his way. This eye for distinctive functions also introduces a kind of specialization that tries the American's patience. A meat market sells meat, not butter, eggs and cheese. The restaurant sells food, but not cigarettes; and the tobacco store, tobacco but not matches. All this an American regards as highly inconvenient accustomed as he is to the American drug store and the super market where he can buy anything except a large tractor. This recognition of limited function has however its merits. The man behind the counter is not a stranger to his commodities. The vegetable man sells nothing but what falls properly under the name of his store, but he is able to tell you just what and how much of this and that goes into a good vegetable soup. Not only is the American drug store a quite un-European institution, but the idea behind it is also quite un-European. Near my home in Los Angeles is a Million Article Store. No European believes that any person can be sufficiently informed about a million articles to render real service to the public in such a store.

All this is not tremendously important, not important enough to write about, if it did not illustrate an important idea, namely, that the European does not believe that democracy means that everyone can do anything as well as anyone else. The European believes that skill requires training, exact and thorough training, and that fine craftsmenship requires experience and adequate preparation, and that where this achievement exists it is considered as worthy of recognition and respect.

Because of this respect for distinctive functions, it is not assumed that a good business man is by that token alone a good elder in the Church. Nor that a highly successful industrialist is necessarily fitted for the State Department. Nor that a good Christian is by that token alone a good Christian School teacher; nor that a good minister necessarily a good missionary or pr fessor. A good layman is not expecte to be a good preacher. The many gif of the Spirit are not reduced to o gift. One virtue is not made a gener substitute for all virtues. It is reco nized that the gifts of the Spirit a diversified and that they are given all the members but not all to o member, nor all to all members. H does not believe that one good man good for all positions and all functio in life. A good man, in short, is n regarded as good for everything.

It is this willingness and ability recognize distinction of functions whi could profitably be exported to Am ican soil — where we have all too litt of it, and where much mediocri springs from the proud assumption th anybody can, without any special trai ing whatever, do anything as well anybody. We Americans have disto ed our legal equality before law into generalized equality that ignores distinction of gifts and function. Fro this distortion stems our large, u bounded faith in the all-sufficiency the single individual. This unqualifi and distinctionless equalitarianis which seeks to raise everybody to t same high level inevitably pulls ever body with all their functions to t

The Reformed Journal

VOLUME III NO.

AUGUST, 1953

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

Rev. Harry R. Boer, Dr. James Daane, Rev. George Stob, Dr. Henry Stob, Dr. Henry Zylstra

Published each month by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Subscription price: $2.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Pos office at Grand Rapids, Mich.

Address all subscriptions and communic tions to:

THE REFORMED JOURNAL
255 Jefferson Avenue, S. E.
Grand Rapids 3, Mich.

same low level. And this "low level" is the price that each man with his distinctive function must pay, when differences of men and functions are not recognized and respected.

Writing as a minister, I should say that this diversity of gifts and distinction of function is a plant that we as churches must use and tend with greater care than we have in the past. Failure to do so will exact its price. If we had a sharper eye and greater respect for diversity of gifts and distinction of function, we should be less inclined to make the merely popular man an elder or deacon or school board member, and the pleasant man into an ecclesiastical executive merely on the basis of his pleasantness. We should then be more critical of the principle that the pious man necessarily makes a good minister, a qualified professor, a reliable church leader, and thus escape that characteristic feature of Pietism which reduces all the gifts and graces of the Spirit to one gift and abuses piety by making it the justification of incompotence and ignorance.

A proper recognition of distinction of gifts and functions would also prevent us from unthinkingly assuming that good elders and good ministers are by that token qualified to judge whether the sociological, philosophical, and scientific views of Christian college professors are thoroughly sound or a bit to the left or right of what is but generally and uncritically assumed to be Reformed in these areas. How can an average elder or minister decide whether a fine and intricate point in an epistemological or sociological view of a Christian professor of epistemology or sociology is strictly Reformed or not? Unless he is a very exceptional man, he obviously cannot do so. Yet we require him to do so even when he does not have, nor claim to have, any competency for such a function. The result is that his own good modesty drives him dutifully to accept the opinions of those who speak as though such a function falls within their competence. Whether or not those who claim competency for such functions actually possess the competence, he in the nature of the case cannot decide. He must simply have faith that the clear strong voice is not the sound of a bull in a china closet. A recognition of the reality of diversity of gifts and functions would enable us to see clearly that the best of men may be the worst of critics when he has left his proper field. For it is plainly true that a theological critic must himself be something of a theologian, and the critic of science something of a scientist.

* * *

This ability and willingness to recognize the reality of distinction of functions serves the European well in still another area. It enables him to achieve fairly clear ideas of the particular purposes of his various institutions. The average *Gereformeerde* church member expects his church to be a church. He intuitively senses that something is wrong when she tries to be something else. He does not remain in his seat when he hears the idea propounded that his Church may do anything but sin. He does not expect nor want his Church to own and operate schools and colleges, to build and own publishing houses, or to sell social security in the name of Christian missions. On the other hand, he does expect his Church to train her own missionaries and not abandon her rightful task to independent institutions.

His feeling about the Sunday School is a case in point. There are indeed exceptions here — as there are perhaps to everything else I have said. But in general the *Gereformeerde* man regards the Sunday School as a mission institution, something to be convened in a school building, and geared to the religious instruction of unchurched children.

After almost a year of attending Dutch churches, I have yet to catch the first glimpse of our kind of Sunday School. In answer to early enquiries as to where my two children could attend Sunday School, I was asked why I thought it necessary for them to attend a Christian School on Sunday when they attended one the other six days of the week. Why, in view of a well-staffed and well-equipped Christian school system, should the Church or Sunday act for forty-five minutes as though this whole Christian School system did not exist? The logic of their answer was based on clear understanding of the distinctive functions of their institutions, and I found I could not turn the logic and good sense of their position.

How different the status and thinking about the Sunday School in our churches. Some desire that it remain what it has traditionally been, a sort of supplement to the Christian School and Catechism class. Others feel it should become a missionary institution for unchurched children. Others feel it should be both. Because there is no singleness of purpose there is no single eye for the attainment of a single goal. But one cannot shoot an eagle by looking at a sparrow. Recent synodical decisions to make the Sunday School all things to all men of divers views, and all things to all sorts of children will accomplish little except the granting of synodical sanction to a body of muddled thinking and cross purposes. My thought here is not to discuss the complex subject of the Sunday School, but merely to illustrate our need to clarify our understanding of the distinctive functions of our various institutions. Synodical definitions of the Sunday School or the Church, or any other of our institutions, which try to include every diversity of opinion in order to keep everybody happy will in the stretch of the years make nobody happy. For the Sunday School and the Church, like every other institution, is like horse-back riding. You can only go in one direction at one time — unless you go in circles, which is to go nowhere in particular.

Distinction of Functions and the Problem of Freedom

Still another value stems from the willingness to recognize the reality of distinctive personal and institutional functions. Such a recognition creates the *freedom* necessary for the performance of such functions. Where distinction of functions is not respected and everyone feels that he can perform the other man's function as well as the man himself, the doors are open to the kind of criticism that deprives the man qualified for his distinctive function of the freedom necessary for the performance of his function. When social or religious communities refuse to recognize distinctions of function and deny the possession of any special competence for the execution of such functions, then the flood-gates of uninformed but effectively damaging criticism are open and the pressure of the mass of uninformed criticism forges the chains which rob both persons and institutions of the freedom to pursue their distinctive functions. In such an atmosphere the Sunday School does not dare to be the Sunday School, and a College and Seminary do not dare to be what they claim to be, truly academic institutions. In such a climate

One Thought on Leaving Holland — Continued

the Christian sociologist, philosopher, or scientist does not dare to state publicly what he believes to be the truth of Christianity for his field. The fruits of a life time of study devoted to a special field must remain hidden from the public eye, lest the public eye see things that it has not seen before and the public mind hear things that it had not thought about before. For new ideas and new insights usually receive merciless treatment by a public which knows no respect for distinction of functions. The fact that it knows little or nothing about the field does not in the least hinder such a public from rendering quick, ready appraisals.

When such a situation obtains, scholarship goes underground, where for want of free airing and free discussion of its insights it soon dies or develops into something distorted and unacceptable. How often criticism has been rendered, sometimes in official documents, sometimes in public meetings, that our college professors do not give our people more leadership in the realms of economics, politics, labor, *et cetera*. In such criticism there is I believe truth. Who knows where many of them stand on "warm issues"? But then who knows where many ministers stand on many of these and on other more ecclesiastical issues? Sometimes the criticism for this lack of leadership seems to suggest that our college professors are either too uninformed, or worse, too spiritually indifferent to give such leadership. This I do not for a moment believe. I suspect that the explanation is something quite different. I suspect that some fear to state what they believe to be the implications of the Christian faith for their fields of study. Their distinctive functions in their respective fields are too little respected. Since many in our religious community are thoroughly convinced that they already have the only Christian answer to many of these issues, the issues are past discussion. Such are not seeking light and leadership, but confirmation of their own quite premature judgments. In such a situation the expert may well fear to announce the findings of his scholarly research, knowing that if his findings do not coincide with the opinions held in the community mind, he may well be inviting the hounds of uninformed criticism to let loose their whole vocabulary of heresy and suspicion and thus bring both his name and position in jeopardy.

In recent years the granting of a doctor's degree by Calvin Seminary has been discussed. If Calvin Seminary ever grants such degrees, we will observe an interesting development. What will happen to the theological student or minister who after careful research posits a thesis which does not completely coincide with an unofficial, noncreedal but nonetheless generally regarded traditional position of the Church? Will his thesis be accepted or rejected? Will he himself suffer loss of theological prestige? Or will we assume that such theological research will always produce findings that will only reinforce our generally held religious impressions about what is Reformed and biblical? If so, what value would such theological research possess? These questions will become real problems if ever we actually move in that direction, problems which will produce unhappy solutions if we do not first gain a new respect for distinction of functions and regain the freedom that grows within such recognition of distinction of function. For if research, whether in College or Seminary, is always considered fair game for the critical arrows shot from anyone's bow, genuine research will not be of long life, if ever it comes to life at all.

There is beyond any doubt more theological and academic freedom in the *Gereformeerde Kerken* and in the Free University than exists in our churches and schools. This is undoubtedly one of the reasons that scholarship flourishes here in The Netherlands as it does not at home. There is plenty of diversity of opinion in here, but it is not forced underground. Open discussion is possible and it requires no great courage to air one's views even if they are not generally held, for there is little inclination to hurriedly employ the language of heresy. None feel themselves under special appointment to lay about with the jaw-bone of a Samson. High churchmen in favor of membership in the World Council of Churches need not resort to the soundproof walls of a colleague's study for fear that speaking in public will cos them their leadership or the garment of their ministry.

One reason for this greater freedor of discussion lies in the fact that ther is an awareness in the *Gereformeerd Kerken* of the difference between a systematic theology and the creeda positions of the Church. Perhaps thi is because they have seen more tha one systematic theology, and the ex perience of seeing one systematic the ology follow another has taught them t recognize the distinction between systematic theology and the binding creedal position of the Church. The know that one person's Dogmatics i his, but not the Church's Dogmatics They know that one man's theologica opinions, even if right and true, ar not ecclesiastically binding on other and cannot, therefore, be used as standard for another man's orthodoxy This allows for theological disagree ment without courting theological cen sure. Kuyper and Bavinck have no been canonized into theological saint nor reduced to theological idols. The are respected but not worshipped. Di agreement with either or both is pos sible without becoming theologicall suspect. For a Dutch minister o theologian to have Kuyper or Bavinc quoted against him in print no mor proves to the membership of th Church that he is un-Reformed than proves that he is a man from Mars. T is this awareness of the distinction be tween one man's opinion and the offici position of the Church that allows th theologian the freedom to execute h distinctive function as a theologian He need not hide the findings of h theological research in silence, but ca freely cast them into the theologica forum without fear of the criticisms o the uninformed, for if they come at al they will be generally ignored. Th gives him the freedom to speak, and i the final analysis it allows the Bib freedom to speak its Word.

This dire necessity of recognizing th reality of *distinctive personal and insti tutional functions*, which creates on th one hand that basis for the necessar *respect* for such functions, and on th other hand guarantees the necessar *freedom* for their execution, is one o the things I should like to be able t carry with me as I return to the State

—James Daane

Dawn and Sunset of Modern Missions

By HARRY R. BOER

EARLY one day in 1944 I stepped out of my tent on the island of Hawaii into the thinning night of a tropical morning. As I stood alone under a heaven still bright with stars an unforgettable sight met my eyes which seemed to bring together in one majestic vision the distant reaches of God's great creation. I saw in the southern sky the five stars that constitute the Southern Cross, and in the northern sky I saw the Great Bear. Here a sort of infinity seemed to concentrate itself in the time and space in which I was standing and I have never been able to forget it. When subsequent to that something of large symbolic significance came to my attention it always reminded me of that early morning in Hawaii.

A few weeks ago an experience of this sort again overtook me. This time it was not two constellations in the heavens, but two booklets in my hands that gave me long, long thoughts. I held in one hand William Carey's *An Enquiry Into The Obligations Of Christians To Use Means For The Conversion Of The Heathen.* It was published in 1792. In the other hand I held *Christian Missions And The Judgment Of God,* by David M. Paton. It was published in 1953. Both are English, both were printed in London. Between them lie the century and six decades which history will record as the massive effort of European and American Protestantism to proclaim the Gospel to the ends of the earth. This period begins with the publication of Carey's book, and it finds a decisive historical turning point in the expulsion of the missionaries from China. To the analysis of this last significant and tragic event Mr. Paton's book is devoted. It will be good and sobering for us to place ourselves between the dawn and the sunset of modern missions and contemplate the lessons which this spectacle can teach us.

Dawn

CAREY'S booklet is probably the most significant if not the most influential publication in the history of the modern missionary movement. Its author was a Baptist by profession and a humble cobbler by trade. His eyes were opened to the need of Christless millions by the accounts of Captain Cook, the great English explorer. Though an unschooled man, Carey had a keen and inquisitive intellect, he read omniverously and found a special interest in the study of botany, geography, languages and the Bible. His universal mind was struck particularly by the universalism of God's promises in Scripture. His study of these promises and of the universality of the Gospel led him to take sharp issue with a reigning misconception held by nearly all orthodox theologians from Calvin and Luther to the men of his time -- the idea that the command of our Lord "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" was binding only on the apostles. From their day on this command was not valid for the Church, it was believed; there remain now only the responsibilities of the local pastor. The spread of the Gospel must follow the processes of normal growth at home, of conquest and commerce abroad, and of such providential openings for witness as God may clearly indicate.

So strongly was this notion intrenched in a significant Protestant area like Germany that when in the 1660's one Baron von Welz pleaded for the continuing character of the mandate given in the Great Commission he was so opposed by the Lutheran theologians that he had to flee the country and hear his plea called "of the devil." Nearly a century and a half later large sections of English Christianity were ready to heed Carey and other spokesmen after him, and from England the vision spread to Holland, Germany, Switzerland, France and America. Societies were organized, funds were raised, men and women volunteered, ships bearing missionaries sailed across the seas, and known and unknown heroes of faith gave their strength, their talents, their lives to plant the Christian flag in unknown lands and on the islands of the sea. At this time begins the record whose pages are bright and awesome with names like Carey (who followed word with deed by going to India), Morrison, Vander Kemp, Mary Slessor, Moffat, Livingstone, Nommensen, Verbeck, Adriani, Keyser — giants all in conception, in daring, in devotion. These all did their work in what Latourette has rightly called "The Great Century," and some lived to see the beginning of the next period, "Advance Through Storm." It has fallen to our lot to see the day which at least on some fronts speaks of retreat before the storm. It is about this that Paton writes. But before we can speak about this let us look at some of the characteristics that have marked the missionary movement during the past century and a half.

Carey pleaded for a world-wide preaching of the Gospel. He was not indifferent to the need of the heathen with respect to education, health, and science, but there is no evidence in his book that he regarded the meeting of these needs as a "preaching of the Gospel." Rather he expected these needs to be met *as a result of the preaching of the Gospel.* In one remarkable passage he writes:

> *After all, the uncivilized state of the heathen, instead of affording an objection* against *preaching the gospel to them, ought to furnish an argument* for *it. Can we as men, or as Christians, hear that a great part of our fellow creatures, whose souls are as immortal as ours, and who are as capable as ourselves, of adorning the gospel, and contributing by their preaching, writings, or practices to the glory of our Redeemer's name, and good of his Church, are inveloped in ignorance and barbarism? Can we hear that they are without the gospel, without government, without laws, and without arts, and sciences; and not exert ourselves to introduce amongst them the sentiments of men, and of Christians? Would not the spread of the Gospel be the most effectual means of their civilization? Would not that make them useful members of society? We know that such effects did in a measure follow the afore-mentioned efforts of Eliot, Brainerd, and others amongst the American Indians; and if similar attempts were made in other parts of the world, and succeeded with a divine blessing (which we have every reason to think they*

Dawn and Sunset of Modern Missions — Continued

would) might we not expect to see able Divines, or read well-conducted treatises in defence of the truth, even amongst those who at present seem to be scarcely human?

What attitude Carey would have taken to the later development of large-scale educational, medical, agricultural and other types of mission work I do not know, but in the thesis posited above he expects the blessings of civilization to follow upon the acceptance of the Gospel. "Would not the spread of the gospel be the most effectual means of their civilization?" There is no evidence here that the introduction of all manner of Christian activity into a heathen society is to be regarded as a "preaching of the Gospel" and therefore a carrying out of the Great Commission. But this was to characterize missions nearly universally when the sun stood higher in the missionary day.

High Noon

THE Christian West was not content with a program of proclamation. It was deeply convinced of the superior quality of its civilization, it shared the sentiment that it was the "White Man's Burden" to transmit its culture to the Orient and to Africa, and it showed little appreciation and often a great deal of contempt for the culture of the people it sought to Christianize. Pity was from the beginning a substantial element in missionary motivation and the pity often amounted to this: the heathen do not have the knowledge, the comforts and skills that we enjoy. As a consequence they suffer. Let us therefore lift them to a higher level of existence. This current ran in and through and alongside the true motivation for missionary effort. The result of this total motivation complex was a mission activity that was often as much intent on civilizing as on evangelizing.

In China particularly was it felt that the social structure must be so influenced as to create an atmosphere favorable to the Church's growth not only, but also to make increasingly possible the introduction of the general benefits of Christianity and civilization enjoyed by the West. Not all Protestant missions were agreed as to this, it is true. The large China Inland Mission did not accept this point of view, and others expressed dissent from what was known as the Social Gospel. Nevertheless the movement was imposing and was characteristic to a marked degree of Protestant missions in China and in other areas at the turn of the century and later.

A leading exponent of this view was Timothy Richard, the secretary of the Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge among the Chinese. In 1891 he outlined a comprehensive program including the publication of periodicals, literature showing the bearing of education and religion on the national life, prizes for essays in national progress, the stimulation of lectures, museums for the enlightenment of China, and the like. Robert Mateer spoke of preparing men "to take the lead in introducing to China the science and arts of western civilization," the purpose of which he qualified as "the best means of gaining access to the higher classes in China." The growth of the new emphasis did not mean that evangelism was ignored, but it did mean that a large proportion of the total Protestant missionary effort was given to social services that did not aim directly at conversion and at the building of the Church. In this respect the Roman Catholics have been more conservative than the Protestants.

What has been the result of this policy? Has it built a strong Church in China? Has it gained for us the respect of the Chinese people? Can we contemplate the total result with a measure of satisfaction? We are not here called to evaluate the result of the Social Gospel simply, but also the results of orthodox missionary effort which availed itself of education and hospitals and rural reconstruction and the like. The answer seems to be, not that the sun rose higher, but rather that the shadows lengthened until at last the missionary sun disappeared behind the Communist horizon.

Sunset

IT is beyond dispute that the reason for the missionary withdrawal from China is a political one, namely the Communist victory and the Communist attitude to the Christian mission. But already before that there were serious doubts in the minds of some missionary leaders about the validity of the missionary policies that had been followed in the past. Paton says that in the months preceding the missionary exodus "it became evident to some of us, and to many more of our Chinese friends, that our mandate had been withdrawn; that the time for missions as we had known them was past; that the end of the missionary era was the will of God." The foreign mission that the writer knew "is now not only out of date but was in important respects wrongly conceived." What brings Paton to this conclusion?

The more important charge that the writer levels against Chinese missions is that "whatever may have been the formal aim of missions, their actual policy was such as not to foster but to preclude the development of a genuinely dynamic self-governing, self-supporting and expanding Church."[1] I shall now let Mr. Paton develop this thought at some length in his own words. I do not do so to save myself the time of analysis and reproduction of his thought, but rather to present the very words of a disillusioned but eloquent spokesman of a missionary community that would follow other policies if it had it in its power to make yesterday again today. But when the day is done and the sun has set we can only contemplate what was done between dawn and sundown.

Writes Paton (pp. 37ff.): "The entire structure and ethos of the Church in China was, with minor much-paraded exceptions, Western. Prayer-books are in the main direct, not to say crudely literal translations of the original. The union hymn-book in general use contains 62 original Chinese hymns out of 512, and 72 Chinese tunes. Church architecture is mainly a matter of brick boxes, with odds and ends of embellishment from the Gothic revival. One could not expect high office — succeed a missionary or become a bishop — unless he had at least a Western-style education and preferably rejoiced in a Western degree. The structure of diocesan organization and account

1. Words strangely reminiscent of many Christian Reformed mission policy declarations with respect to the Indian field. It has been officially announced policy to endeavor to secure an "indigenous Church" on the Indian field. But during all the years that this announcement was made and repeated we went all out on an educational and medical program which used up the larger part of more than a quarter million dollars a year for this small field. Meanwhile the missionaries retain complete control of such church development as manifested itself.

was based on western models, and is grotesquely complicated for the numbers involved, and the relative simplicity of Church life. Missionaries, with few exceptions, maintained a Western style and standard of living, in which they were joined by those of their national colleagues who had attained the education and the financial means to do so. Chinese Christian leaders with some exceptions, have been notorious for their poor grasp of Chinese literature and philosophy, and have often been more at home in the English language and in Western culture. . .

"The educated Christian leaders were inevitably regarded by the Communist authorities as mainly a reactionary force; they were, however, known to be very discontented; and they possessed a high degree of aquaintance with and mastery of western scientific and technological methods. They are therefore in need of indoctrination and reform, and because of their potential contribution, worth a good deal of attention. In those facts lie the principal causes of the pressure upon the Church in China today.

"It is not otherwise with the Church's institutions. Our schools were started to produce subordinate professional workers for the Church; they expanded to become the principal training-grounds from which were recruited those who filled positions in the world of the *compradore* — the Customs Service, the Salt *Gabelle*, the Postal Administration, and the foreign firms, and the Chinese banks and business houses which were associated with them. Many of the more ardent spirits were stirred by their shame at their country's weakness and their anger at the wrongs it suffered at the hands of foreigners . . . They went over in the end to the Communist Party, in which there are surprisingly large numbers of people with this close but extremely partial acquaintance with Christian missions. Others, again, became Christians. But the Church has been mainly among the poor and ignorant, and the rank and file of the ministry not such as are able to attract and hold educated young people; moreover, the schools and colleges have been dominated for the most part by a highly liberal version of Protestantism, while the Churches have been mainly fundamentalist. Few educated young people have found a permanent and satisfying home in the Church . . . Last of all, some of the most zealous Christians among the alumni of our schools have joined and become leaders in the indigenous sects which are nationalist, in reaction against missionaries, and pentecostalist and millenarist, in reaction against the sterility of the Church and the badness of the times.

"Whether they are viewed therefore from the angle of their creative contribution to the needs of Chinese society, or their provision of leadership from the Chinese Church, the educational institutions on which we have lavished so much time, money, and loving hard work, seem for the most part to have made a poor return. The case of the hospitals is not substantially different. They have of course healed very large numbers: but they have not created a Chinese medical profession with a conception of its task relative to Chinese conditions, nor have they been an effective sign of the Christian passion that men and women should have wholeness of life . . . The real need of China, however, medically speaking, is for basic work in public health, the control of epidemics, and the reduction of malnutrition — a program requiring much larger numbers of workers, with a substantially lower standard of training, stationed in villages and market towns all over the country. This is the programme of the Communists, not of the Christians. The public health programme of the Church hospitals when there has been one, has too often been centered upon the hospital, and to be effective outside a narrow radius has required vast expenditure of foreign money on transport . . .

"This picture is doubtless somewhat overdrawn for emphasis; any missionary could point to exceptions in his own experience. As the writer reflects on *his* own experience — chairman of a hospital board of managers, secretary of a college board of managers, and concerned with several schools and another hospital — he cannot feel that it is more than a modest exaggeration of a real truth."

Reflections at Twilight

THESE excerpts may serve to indicate the nature of the indictment that Paton levels against missions as they have been pursued in China. Even though the author speaks only about the Chinese situation his words are eminently worth universal attention. It is significant that Paton writes, "And can a China missionary be free of the fear that what was true of China is still true of India and Africa?" China was but a massive expression of what the western missionary enterprise was everywhere doing in greater or less degree. We know how thoroughly these policies have been pursued on our own Indian field for decades, and one wonders what to make of the proposal laid before Synod this year, without prior publication in the Agenda, for the erection of a $100,000 hospital at Lupwe on our Nigerian field.

In any case, Paton's booklet, searching and honest, drives us back to the question, Why this flight of missions into institutionalism in the first place? It has already been suggested that an important reason was the desire of the West to communicate its culture to the Orient and to Africa. No doubt other reasons could be mentioned. Beyond question one was the implicit individualism in the title of Carey's book, *The Obligations of Christians to Use Means For the Conversion of the Heathen.* Note well: of Christians: Not, of the Church; but, of Christians. This conception lies at the bottom of the rise of missionary societies rather than Church missions, and the activities in which individuals may engage are limitless. But it cannot be denied that when the churches themselves took up the missionary task, as is largely the case in America, they followed almost the identical pattern the European societies pursued in their mission methods. The cause goes deeper, therefore, and I believe that it is ultimately traceable to the conception that one entertains of the Church and of the Gospel. If the preaching of the Gospel is conceived so broadly that it includes everything from preaching and Bible classes to conducting schools, hospitals and experimental farms, and if the Church be regarded as the agency through which all these activities are to be carried out, then clearly the Gospel has become something more than the Gospel and the Church has become something more than the Church. And when missions are based on such a conception of the Gospel and of the Church, then we are equally clearly inviting missionary disaster. It is not a light matter when Mr. Paton describes that which happened to the missionary enterprise in China as *Judgment.*

Dawn and Sunset of Modern Missions — Continued

It is necessary again to think our way clearly and deeply into the nature of the Church and of the Gospel. It is very true that the hour is late. We do not know how much longer we shall be able to be missionarily engaged in many mission areas. But perhaps we can render this service to the Younger Churches: that we come to a clearer understanding of the problem, a firmer grasp of the missionary task, and convey this understanding of problem and task to the Younger Churches to guide them in the huge missionary labors that lie before them in their several homelands. If we can show them that the task of the Church is a very limited one, but that that limited task is so demanding, and so rewarding when conscientiously pursued, that there is no time for side-activities, we shall have performed no small service. They must learn that it is no more the function of the Church to offer a general education on the mission field than it is the function of schools to build furniture. If schools were to go into the furniture manufacturing business I do not doubt that they could turn out a great deal of eminently useful furniture. We all know what has been done in vocational schools. But in the long run this fine furniture would be found to be a rather poor substitute for a citizenry that has a fair understanding of the humanities and the sciences. We must impress on the Younger Churches that our missions have been too busy "building furniture." We have done a lot of good work in this direction no doubt. We have made acceptable bank clerks and school teachers, have produced better strains of rice, have sent many fine influences into the public life of China, Japan, India, Africa and so many other places. But in it all the building of the Church of Christ, the faithful preaching of the Gospel, the patient nurture in faith, knowledge, and grace has lagged sadly behind. So much of what we have done looked like Christianity but it turned out to be something less than Christianity because we looked for the fruit before the tree was mature and sometimes before it was even planted. Such an inversion of the divine order invites the divine judgment, and in one large missionary area it has come and that quite unmistakably.

THE 1953 Synod of the Christian Reformed Church adopted "in spirit and general content" the Minority Report on Education on the mission field. The type of mission method which Paton so strongly criticizes both as to its results and because it was "wrongly conceived" is criticized by the Minority Report on grounds of the Reformed conception of the Church. We must not suppose, however, that the adoption of this report is a guarantee against following methods in the future that have been weighed and found wanting. We have made fine declarations on the indigenous method of mission work before and have often paid little attention to them in our missionary practice. We shall need to retain our vigilance, continue our study of mission principles and in all this we will find it most helpful to listen carefully as men of experience reflect on the missionary labors that have been performed by other bodies. There is, I think, no better place to start than Paton's book. You can have it by sending a check of $1.00 to SCM Press, Ltd., 56 Bloomsbury St., London.

Advisory Committees at Our Synods

By JOHN GRITTER*

ADVISORY committees at Synods have been in vogue longer than the present generation can remember, possibly from the beginning. No doubt they fill a need. It is difficult to see how our Synods could dispense with them without much loss of time and efficiency. There are always certain matters on a Synodical table which need to be predigested and put in a form so that Synod can act on them intelligently and in a minimum of time. Take, for instance, appeals. In the nature of things they present two parties. These both present their materials and their arguments. It is very desirable that some impartial committee go over these materials, digest them, summarize them, and advise Synod as to possible action on them. Then there are certain overtures. Often they have to be compared with other matters on the Synodical table, require the checking of certain data, and the like. A committee doing this can save Synod some valuable time. At times there are controversial matters, issues on which there is a decided difference of insight, which ought to be faced. Certainly some committee ought to guide the Synod through the argumentation presented, and recommend some form of action with arguments well thought out. So these committees fill a real need. No doubt they have often rendered very valuable service.

However, it is the impression of the writer that in regard to these committees certain limitations ought to apply. He has felt that at previous Synods, and at the 1953 Synod, just past, this came to him with renewed force, so much so that he thought it well to put them down for consideration.

In what follows certain criticisms are implied or expressed. Let it be understood that we are not in any way attacking persons; we are discussing a method of doing things which we believe needs to be watched and to be used with care. The question is whether in the use of these advisory committees we are acting as efficiently and correctly as we ought.

On that point the writer has certain strictures.

They are five.

FIRST: We ought not to overload our advisory committees.

At the Synod of 1953, in our opinion that was done in the case of several. They simply had too much material to handle. Some of them met till late in

* The Reverend Mr. John Gritter is Missionary of the Christian Reformed Church to Canada. His home is in London, Ontario.

the evening, even had to use their recesses, which ought to be kept for rest and refreshing and a bit of fellowship, in order to pass on all the material assigned them. Some of the work presented at Synod bore marks of haste. Possibly the clerks would be more likely to notice that than others. One chairman openly confessed that his committee was so busy that a certain document entrusted to them had admittedly not received proper attention; so it was taken up on the floor of Synod. One can well understand such things. But they ought not to be. That does not make for good work. Similar situations in the past have led to formulations which later proved to be immature. We have too much of that at our synods and we ought to overcome it. One way is to try not to overload our advisory committees.

This can to an extent be accomplished if Synod will take seriously its own rule in regard to the distribution of materials. The Rules for Synodical Procedure state about the Program Committee: "It shall be the duty of this committee to classify all the reports, overtures, and other communications into various groups, and to advise which matters shall be laid directly before Synod, and which shall be placed in the hands of advisory committees." It is expected, then, that certain matters shall be laid directly before Synod. The Program Committee is to determine which they shall be. At our recent Synods very little has come of this. To the best of our knowledge, at the latest Synod, about the only matters which came directly before the delegates were those on which the Stated Clerk reported. Practically all else was given to committees. The rule quoted above evidently was forgotten. Some times we are in such a hurry to get ahead that we forget our own rules. Reflecting on this now it appears to us that much of the material could have been brought directly before Synod without burdening a committee with it. There are a number of routine reports, which require no particular action, except possibly by the Budget Committee, which could be taken up directly; thus, we should be saving some valuable space in our *Acts* too. There was, for instance, that rather long report on our relation to other churches. Was it necessary for an advisory committee to wade through that and then at the end simply support the advice of the standing committee on this matter, namely, that this be received as information? There are in each report of the standing committees of Synod a number of routine matters which require very little discussion and often elicit none. There is always a lot of material which is passed from standing committees to advisory committees and from them to Synod largely in routine fashion. There ought to be some way of weeding it out and thus seeing to it that only such materials as really require it be given to advisory committees. This would give these committees opportunity to do better work, too.

SECOND: We ought not to overrate the importance of these committees.

When one soberly reflects, both from observation and by participation, on the actual activities of these committees one concludes that he cannot expect too much from them. Their time is extremely limited. They must work themselves into many matters. Officially it is assumed that the members when they came to Synod had read and pretty well digested the material given in the *Agenda*. But why keep up this pretense? We all know that actually that is not the true state of affairs. Usually the *Agenda* do not arrive till about a month before Synod. Then one must make his preparations; there are many things to be done. The fact is that most of us do pretty well if by the time we come to Synod we have actually read the material in the *Agenda* once. That is not digesting it so that one is prepared to express a judgment on it. On top of that come the supplementary reports. Consequently these committees must work themselves into much material or express superficial judgments. One of the advisers at Synod jocularly remarked about a certain report that he had not thoroughly digested it and that he had a sneaking suspicion that even the committee had not thoroughly digested it. This sally drew a burst of good-natured merriment. Everybody knew what he meant. Hence one must not blame us if we do not evaluate the work of such committees too highly. Surely, we have great respect for them. By and large they are made up of good men. But they have their limitations, too. And they are not usually experts on the matters assigned them. We ought not to expect too much of them.

Some would remark that these committees serve a good purpose as a check on standing committees and study committees. No doubt the idea of a check is a good one. It is a part of democratic procedure. We all need to be watched. Power tends to corruption. It is good for boards and committees to know that their work will be checked. But here we should like to offer three remarks:

At times there is in this idea an element of suspicion that we ought to combat. Those not in boards are inclined to think that those who are in want to dominate. When one lives at a distance one is inclined to think so. The writer, when in Iowa, had a little of it, too. There is, indeed, such danger. But we ought not to let that figure prominently in our thinking. If we do, we lose the atmosphere of brotherly confidence and fellowship. If we think that something is not right we ought to ask about it, be frank about it. But we ought to beware of wanting checks because we do not trust one another.

Further, as a check, too, these committees do not rank too high. Again the limitations pointed out above come into focus. How could one expect a committee in the time of three or four evenings, at the most, to get such a complete insight that it would constitute an adequate check against supposed corruption? How would they go about it? Suppose that there are questions about appointees and other matters. Where does the committee go for answers? Of course, to the secretary of the committee whose work they are to check. Seldom do they go beyond that. Is it not plain that our best guarantee that things are done right is to elect good, sound members in our boards? That means much more than a superficial check at the Synod.

And finally, Synod itself sometimes is a better check than a committee. This latest Synod came to the conclusion that it wanted more information before approving certain expenditures on the work in Ceylon and South America. There was at least an impression that we might be involving ourselves too deeply. So the matter was deferred and the standing committee was asked to present fuller information next year. That was definitely a check. Where did it come from? Not from the advisory committee on the matter, but from other members on the floor of Synod. An alert Synod is a good check.

Advisory Committees at Our Synods — Continued

So we say, these committees fill a good place. But do not overrate them: they definitely have their limitations too.

THIRD: We should not give to these committees the work and dignity which properly belongs to standing committees and study committees.

We are thinking, for instance, of the three large committees of synod, the Board of Trustees of Calvin College and Seminary, the Christian Reformed Board of Missions, and the General Committee of Home Missions. Though two of them are called Boards for the sake of incorporation, *etc.*, they are really committees of Synod, each administering a large part of the activities of the Church. All three are large bodies, having one representative of each of our twenty-four classes and a number of general lay-delegates besides. They each conduct a large enterprise of the Church involving well over half a million dollars annually. They deliberate for days, sometimes for weeks. They perform enormous amounts of work, so that it takes new members in them several months to be posted on all that is going on. When Synod comes near they draw up lengthy reports, carefully written, full of details. Often, to judge of their recommendations, one needs to know a mass of facts back of them.

What happens to these reports? Parts of them are printed in the *Agenda*, as much as the secretaries can get ready by March 15; the rest is placed in the hands of the delegates when they gather. How to read all this carefully and to digest it is a question that has puzzled many a delegate. Then these reports are given to advisory committees for advice. These committees are much smaller, are not representative of the whole Church, are made up to a large extent of men who have rather little previous knowledge of such matters. who cannot be called experts. In fact, in the interest of impartial judgment members of boards whose reports are to be taken up are usually kept out of such committees. These committees are then supposed to be able by meeting one full day and a few evenings to pass intelligently on such materials so that Synod can have full assurance that everything has been carefully considered. When the matters come to the floor of Synod, the reporter of the advisory committee reports on these matters and does most of the talking. The secretary of the standing committee has an advisory vote. But in general the information needed must first be poured into the smaller advisory committee and through it be funnelled to Synod.

Brethren, with all respect for the wisdom of Synods, that does not seem right. Should not these standing committees, such as the Board of Trustees and the Board of Missions and the General Home Missions Committee, report directly to Synod? Who is better qualified to speak, for instance, for the Board of Missions, than our Director of Missions? Why should our expert on Missions have to sit at Synod as an adviser only, and be asked to give his information to an advisory committee and not to the Synod where all the delegates could benefit by it? He being a modest man, little was heard from him. Yet he is our expert. The same holds for other committees with their secretaries. We believe that these bodies ought to be requested to report directly; smaller, routine matters could be acted on at once; matters needing advice could be committed. Coming to think of it, the writer remembers when the late Mr. J. B. Hulst used to read the report of the Publication Committee to Synod, and others would do likewise.

Perhaps the writer feels a bit keenly on this because what he is saying is somewhat rooted in experience too. When some years ago the Board of Trustees saw fit to make him its secretary, he used to plug and plug away (as all such secretaries have to do) to write good reports. It usually involved days of labor. When the report was finished it was given into the hands of a committee. He was to be present only when the committee wanted him. Questions were asked. Sometimes the atmosphere was friendly, sometimes not too friendly. Occasionally one had a feeling of being called on the carpet. At times it left a bit of resentment. That resentment has long since been gone, but the question persists: Is that the way we want to treat our standing committees? It does not seem right.

The same holds, of course, for the smaller committees not mentioned, and for study committees.

The advisory committees ought not to usurp the place and the work and th dignity of these standing committee They ought to supplement. Wh Synod is not satisfied with the work these standing committees, needs mo information or a better formulation, something like that, they ought to co in. That looks to us like a logic set-up.

In this connection there is an inte esting item in the Rules of Synodic Procedure. It provides that when advisory committee has in hand report of a study committee, and feels constrained to present reco mendations which differ radically fr those of the study committee, t recommendations of the study comm tee shall have precedence on the flo or Synod. That is to protect the stu committees. Fine. Now look: In ca the advisory committee disagrees, t recommendations of the study comm tee are good enough to be taken up rectly, even though opposed by the a visory committee. But if the adviso committee agrees, the recommendatio of the study committee come throu the advisory committee? Why not them come directly in that case to Some will say that in that way Syn has an extra assurance that the reco mendations are worthy of acceptan But in case the advisory committ does not think so its opinion is of little weight that the study committ is given the green light. Why not either case let the study committee port directly?

FOURTH: The extent to wh advisory committees may go ought be more clearly defined.

Some committees at our latest Sy did things which we believe are neit correct nor fair. Please notice: we not calling motives into question. Si ilar things have been done at previo Synods. No doubt these brethr thought they were acting within th mandate. Yet, reflecting on this aft ward we are convinced they went so what beyond their proper bounds.

One committee was asked to give vice on a nomination made by Board of Trustees. It removed t names from the nomination and ado one. This action was quickly challeng on the floor of Synod and the nam were restored. We believe rightly The committee's work was not to m a nomination, but to advise on nomination submitted. If it thou

the nomination was not a good one it should have told Synod so and given its reasons. To add or take away was in our opinion incorrect. And unjust: if that could be done it would be possible for a small committee at Synod to frustrate the work of a much larger and permanent committee, the Board of Trustees. Surely, we do not want that.

Two different committees were asked to advise on reports both of which happened to have a majority and minority side. One committee advised in favor of the majority, completely ignoring the minority; the other ignored the majority and favored the minority but dropped the reasoning supporting it and substituted grounds of its own. We believe that too in both instances was incorrect: We believe in such instances the advisory committee should present both sides, giving an evaluation of both positions, with reasons, and then let Synod choose. That would seem to be the only fair way, too. Else it can happen that the report even of a majority of a study committee is not even discussed by Synod. That seems hardly a fair way of treating a study committee. And it gives too much power to an advisory committee.

In another instance an advisory committee took the recommendation *re* tuition to be paid at the Zuni school, a recommendation of both the Board of Missions and a study committee, and substituted another. The Board of Missions had consciously faced that matter, had deliberately chosen for the date it recommended, yet the advisory committee went contrary to it. That should not have happened. If the advisory committee thought the Board was in error, well; then let it so advise Synod and give its reasons; but not substitute something else. That, too, we believe, was incorrect and unjust.

We repeat, there was no wrong intent here. It just brings out the point under discussion, namely, that the power of these committees ought to be more clearly defined.

FIFTH: Advisory committees can never substitute for Synod itself. What we have in mind is this: Occasionally, especially when there is some matter of appeal up, which is taking a lot of time, there are voices suggesting that the matter ought to be settled in the committee. If the appellant asks for the floor some will say that he has been heard by the committee, and that he should not take the precious time of Synod. We can understand that reasoning. Appeals can consume much time. We believe that it is entirely proper that the matter be first heard by a committee and that it prepare the matter for Synod. No doubt it is correct too that Synod after all has the right to determine how these appeals shall be treated. But let us not forget that the Church Order definitely guarantees any member of the Church the right of appeal to our broadest assembly. And we do not believe that the intent of the Church Order has been satisfied if a member who feels aggrieved and appeals to Synod has been heard by a committee of about twleve men appointed by Synod. If any of us were ever to stand in the place of such an aggrieved person, and felt that we had not received justice we certainly could not be satisfied with that kind of arrangement. Why, that would in effect mean that one was appealing from a larger body, such as a classis, to a much smaller body, a committee of Synod. Such a committee can never be the Synod. It might be well to remember that.

In conclusion:

Advisory Committees are *advisory;* they are assisting committees to facilitate the work of Synod.

They are only for the duration of Synod. They are not to be compared, as far as importance goes, with the standing committees and study committees.

They render advice on what is submitted to them; they must not put something else in the place of it.

We are jealous of power. We ought to be. If we think we need these committees, as checks, very well. But then let us make sure that the checks are properly checked.

The Radicalism of Thomas Muenzer

A Chapter from the History of Anabaptism

By SIMON J. DE VRIES*

A farmer who wants to clear the brush off a certain field by setting it on fire must be on the alert to see that the flame does not leap across to a stretch of dry forest or a field of ripe grain which might be located nearby. A bit of tinder often goes wildly out of control and causes tragic loss to material never intended for the flame.

Thus it was that when Martin Luther and his co-workers attempted to reform the Church on purely religious principles and to restore it to its scriptural norm, there were other men who seized advantage of the initiative of his reform and carried it far beyond the moderate measures which Luther himself had envisaged. In more than one sense sixteenth-century Europe was ripe for the Reformation. It was also ripe for wild disorder. There were these men of fanatical and sectarian spirit who were eager for just such an opportunity as Luther's conflict with the Pope afforded them.

There had always been ecstatic persons and parties in the Church, such as the Montanists in ancient times and the Albigenses and Franciscans during the Middle Ages. So too when the Reformation began there were visionaries and enthusiasts, men who were the spiritual descendents of the medieval sectaries and who were to provide much of the manpower as well as much of the program of Anabaptism. The German name for this class in general is "*Schwaermer,*" meaning fanatics or enthusiasts. Luther professed to be more fearful of them than of the Pope and the Emperor combined.

These enthusiasts received strong encouragement from Luther's writings and originally considered him to be their natural leader and ally. Luther gave them, or confirmed in them, the ideal of a direct personal relationship between man and his God, in opposition to Roman Catholic sacramentalism. Thus with Luther's doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers they

* The Reverend Mr. Simon J. De Vries is Minister of the Christian Reformed Church at Prairie City, Iowa.

The Radicalism of Thomas Muenzer — Continued

were heartily in agreement. So too they were in accord with the reformer's emphasis on the direct working of the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart.

The big trouble was that these *Schwaermer* carried Luther's ideas to excess. They seized the torch which he set under the structure of Roman sacramentalism and with it tried to destroy the whole basis of the medieval Church. Further, the Holy Spirit, whose testimony Luther taught to be a vital accompaniment of the Word, was interpreted by them to be a certain dynamic inner spark which made the objective Word unnecessary and irrelevant.

One of the outstanding leaders of the enthusiasts, and a person who caused Luther no end of anxiety, was Thomas Muenzer, a man of great capabilities and deplorable aberrations, a man in whom seemingly contradictory impulses were combined. Muenzer was an esteemed pastor and talented theologian and enjoyed at one time the sincere friendship of Luther. Yet he became a fanatical revolutionary and the violent preacher of communism. He turned out to be a visionary and a chiliast, striving to accomplish the millennial kingdom by force. It was he who became to a great degree responsible for the disastrous Peasants' Revolt of 1524-25.

Thomas Muenzer as Luther's enemy became a powerful threat to his reform, since Luther's opposition to him was interpreted by the peasant-allies of Muenzer as opposition to the lower classes as such. Luther felt that he had to oppose Muenzer's radicalism as well as the excesses of the Peasant's Revolt with all his influence. But for him, as Williston Walker summarizes it (*History of the Christian Church*, p. 354), "the cost was great. Popular sympathy for his cause among the lower orders of southern Germany was largely forfeited, his own distrust of the common man was augmented, his feeling that the reform must be the work of the temporal princes greatly strengthened. His opponents, moreover, pointed to these uprisings as the natural fruitage of rebellion against the ancient church." A further result of Luther's unfortunate experience with Muenzer was that he came in later years to be willing to participate in persecution of the Anabaptists, something he would never have dreamed of doing in the beginnings of the Reformation.

Thus it appears that Thomas Muenzer was a man of dangerous influence, a man who brandished the torch of insurrection and who spread the seeds of disorder in church and state, a man whom Luther would have liked to have ignored, but could not.

Muenzer's Mysticism

Basic to an understanding of the character and career of Thomas Muenzer is the realization that he was a true mystic. His mysticism, together with his propensities toward radicalism, and considered in the light of the times in which he lived, explain all that Muenzer thought and did.

The casual observer might account it rather far-fetched to call such a man as Muenzer a mystic. To the popular mind a mystic is one who spends his hours in placid contemplation of the super-sensuous, one who tends to negate the temporal world and to assume a passivity towards what is going on about him. We think of the Hindu seeking union with Brahman, or of St. Theresa, or of Pseudo-Dionysius, or even of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. These were mystics. But Thomas Muenzer was as different from these as anyone could fairly be. Muenzer was filled with fiery energy and burning with passion, a fierce prophet wielding "the Sword of Gideon"[1] as he goaded on the angry peasants against their masters. If anyone was ever intensely interested in what was going on about him, it was he.

Yet it is true that Muenzer was a mystic. Even though he wrote no learned tomes on the *via contemplativa* he stood solidly within the mystical tradition, as did a great many of the enthusiasts of the Anabaptist movement. It is true, of course, that these persons were not mystics of the classical type. They did not deny the finite, as many mystics, even within Christendom, have tended to do. The oneness with the Divine which they sought was nothing more than a *dynamic* (in distinction from an ontological) unity, in which the Holy Spirit was believed drive the human soul without denyi the finite personality.

If we should desire to search in Muenzer's early history and to exami his youthful associations, with a vi to discovering the origins of his mys cal tendencies, we would be at an utt loss because of lack of source-materi were it not for an old book which one time belonged to Muenzer a which was discovered by G. T. Strob Strobel mentions this important bo in his work, *Leben, Schriften, u Lehren Thomae Muentzers*, publish in Nuremberg in 1791. This book Muenzer's, according to Strobel, co sisted of two parts, one part containi a collection of visions and the other number of sermons by Johannes Ta er, the great German mystic of earlier time. Its margins contain many annotations in Muenzer's o hand, showing that he read it assid ously and with evident interest. Stro also states that Muenzer was deeply i terested in the prophecies of the A bot Joachim. It is known, too, that t *Theologica Germanica* had an influe upon him. No doubt mystical writi of this kind had an important part forming Muenzer's philosophy. I them he was brought into touch wi most of the great "spirituals" of t late Middle Ages.

Little is actually known Muenzer's early life, but we find h with Luther in Wittenberg before t Diet of Worms. At that time he a the great reformer were evidently the best of terms. Luther even reco mended him for the pastorate in Zwi au, to his later regret. This was 1520. In Zwickau Muenzer's myst and radical tendencies rapidly beca manifest, so that ere long he w preaching what he called "purely sp itual religion." Believing that Lut had not gone far enough in his refor Muenzer began to make vehement tacks on the monks and mendica friars, and soon had the whole city an uproar. He professed to be do nated by two principles; firstly, the i mediate guidance of the Holy Spi which impelled him to speak and with divine authority; and second the need to gather together all the t saints into a pure church, rejecting w violence all that was contrary to Naturally these excesses provoked qu reaction on the part of the authori

1. Muenzer used various fanciful descriptions of his own role as leader of the insurrectionists. Some of his inflammatory letters and addresses to the peasants, in which he speaks of himself in this manner, are reproduced in G. T. Strobel's book, *Leben, Schriften, und Lehren Thomae Muentzers*, pp. 93ff.

who deposed him and compelled him to leave. Throughout the rest of his career Muenzer's rabid enthusiasm brought him into increasing difficulties as he wandered from place to place, and in the end it became the force which brought him and thousands of pitiable peasants to a bloody death.

Muenzer differed the most sharply from Luther in his insistence upon the Divine Spirit's immediate enlightenment of all true saints. The Spirit, said Muenzer, speaks directly to their innermost being, and therefore this "inner light" is much more important than the message that comes in the Bible. We have, as testimony that this was actually Muenzer's teaching, the word of a contemporary of his, Sebastian Franck, who recounts in his *Ketzerchronik* (History of Heretics) the following:[2]

> *He cares not for Scripture nor for the external Word, that faith should come or be given through them, but only for the heavenly voice and the 'living Word of God.' For this reason he was named 'a prophet from heaven,' mockingly by many but in earnest by his own followers. One must not be taught by books or by sermons, but by the living voice of God and by the heavenly word within. (He further taught) that all preaching and all reading is worthless unless a man has first heard Christ preaching in his heart.*

This is confirmed by an examination of Muenzer's own writings, many of which Strobel, in the work referred to above, reproduces. In the following passage translated from Strobel one may read Muenzer's own words concerning the nature of this inner voice:

> *The Word is not far from thee: behold, it is in thy heart. You ask, how does it get into one's heart? The answer: it comes down from God in a tremendous astonishment* (hohen Verwunderung.) *And this astonishment, whether it be God's Word or not, makes itself felt at the time that a child is six or seven years old, according to the figure of Numbers* 19. *To this purpose St. Paul refers to Moses and Isaiah in Romans* 10 *and speaks there of hearing the inner Word in the depths of the soul through the revelation of God. Whoever does not become aware of and sensitive to this Word through the living witness of God (Romans* 8) *can never say anything fundamental about God even though he has devoured ten thousand Bibles. In order that man might become aware of the Word of God and become sensitive to it, it is necessary that God should take away his fleshly lusts; and if the movings of God make themselves felt in his heart, it is necessary that all desire of the flesh should be slain, in order that he might make a place for God and in order that he might receive His workings; for a beastly man receives not the things that God speaks in the soul* (I Cor. 2).

And so Muenzer goes on. Incidentally, it is interesting to observe from passages like this the type of exegesis employed by Muenzer; likewise the literalistic appeal which he makes to Scripture for support of his depreciation of Scripture in favor of the inner Word.

THE inner speaking of the voice of God was the central element in Muenzer's epistemology. He taught that no person who lacked this inner teaching was a true Christian. Thus religion was not something objective or external to him; rather, in true religion "the Father unceasingly forms the Son in us; and the Holy Spirit, through heart-felt sorrow, interprets in us none other than the crucified."[3]

Muenzer's religion was thus utterly subjective. He heaped scorn upon the "*Schriftgelehrten,*" as he dubbed the Wittenberg reformers. Thus in one particularly acrimonious deliverance he wrote, "Es muss ein jeder die Kunst Gottes, den rechten Christenglauben nicht durch den stinkenden Glauben teuflicher Schriftgelehrten ueberkommen, sondern durchs ewige kraeftige Wort des Vaters im Sohn mit Erlauterung des H. Geistes." This quotation is given untranslated because in it Muenzer appears to use the term "Kunst" in a highly peculiar sense. Undoubtedly he meant by "die Kunst Gottes" an inward mystical knowledge of and power of God.[4]

Muenzer appealed to this inner light as authorization for whatever he felt moved to do. He relied upon it for direction in all the ordinary activities of life, according to Melanchthon's testimony.[5] He built his entire course of action upon these dreams and revelations. Thus his program of violence and insurrection against the princes was claimed by him to have divine sanction. He specifically said in his address to the peasants just before the battle of Frankenhausen: "God has told me by His own mouth to go on . . . We have a command from God."

This then was the Christian life, the substance of faith, in Muenzer's opinion; to have a constant inner communion with the Deity and to receive communications directly from Him. Anyone who entirely lacked this inner light was under suspicion. But one should not imagine that the elect come to this blessed state without a severe struggle. On the contrary, Muenzer taught, the way of true sainthood is often a long, bitter, and difficult road. Muenzer, like most mystics, defined a definite process of self-preparation for communion with God. He defined five steps in his way to faith or "*Wege des Durchbruchs.*" As set forth by Bloch in his book, *Thomas Muenzer als Theologe der Revolution* (p. 260), these five steps are the following: (1) *die Entgroebung* (abandonment of gross sins); (2) *die Studierung* (meditation on God and desire for betterment); (3) *die Verwunderung* (speculations about sin and grace); (4) *die lange Weile* (trembling before the Law and discovering one's deep misery); and (5) *suspensio gratiae* (deep unbelief and doubting). This fifth degree was the most important, for in it the deep interior of the soul is plumbed, so that in quiet and profound resignation man receives the true Word of God. At this point all things are resolved, and the sinner becomes a saint.

ONE will note how strikingly different Muenzer's way to faith was from Luther's. Luther experienced a particularly bitter struggle before finding the full light of the Gospel, and it was at last only through diligent study of the Bible as unfolded to him by the

2. Strobel, *op cit.*, pp. 188f, translated.

3. Muenzer's words quoted by K. Kautsky in *Communism in Central Europe*, London, 1897 p. 115.

4. Strobel, *op. cit.*, gives further numerous examples of this emphasis on the inner light, both from Muenzer's own writings and from the writings of Melanchthon, Spangenberg, Franck *et alii.*

5. Probably we should not be too suspicious of Luther himself when he tells us (Strobel, *op. cit.*, p. 184) "Von der Ehe lehrte er also: dass ein Mann nicht soll bey seinem Weibe schlaffen, er waere denn zuvor durch goettliche Offenbarung und Eingebung gewiss, dass er wuerde mit ihr einen heiligen Sohn oder Tochter zeugen; die das nicht thaeten, die braechen die Ehe mit ihren Weibern."

The Radicalism of Thomas Muenzer — Continued

Holy Spirit that he found peace. Luther taught accordingly that the testimony of God's enscripturated Word was the only true means through which a person is saved, even though the severity of his own particular struggle might not be the normal experience of the convert. The important thing was the testimony of Scripture. With Muenzer, however, the exterior preaching of the Gospel had little or nothing to do with salvation. Similarly to Luther, he had come to his convictions through deep distresses of soul, but he had probably experienced that religious certainty came at the very point where his unbelief was the deepest and that Scripture was not instrumental in giving him this certainty. Very naturally he went on to define his own bitter conversion as normative for all the saints. (Unfortunately, unlike Luther's his experience was not scripturally valid.) Muenzer appealed to the example of biblical heroes in an attempt to show that the proper way to faith is always a hard and bitter road.[6] The way to faith, he said, is by reaching down into the innermost ground of the soul and becoming "deified"[7] by the Father through the incarnation of Christ in the heart. And now constantly the saint must maintain visionary contact with God through inner afflictions and through the horrifying "*Furcht Gottes*" in his innermost being. In this manner the Holy Spirit comes "to clear away the thorns and weeds" and to speak to the soul of man.

This bitter way to faith is the way of the cross, the way of the bitter Christ. The cross for Muenzer was not an external objective event, as it was for Luther and for all evangelical Christians, but it was that extreme situation of despair and doubt to which man is driven in the boundary of his finite existence. It was the point of *suspensio gratiae*, where man loses all certainty and God takes over. This for Muenzer was the meaning of the cross, a typically mystical idea.

Corresponding to the bitter cross was the bitter Christ. Muenzer's Christ was not meek and gentle, a Comforter and Saviour of men, but only a fiery and reproachful Judge, one who brings denunciation and destruction upon the wicked. Accordingly, Muenzer's ideal of a true preacher was one who "does not present God's Word with honey-sweet words and hypocrisy upon his lips, but who with a fervent and truly burning zeal seeks to root out the make-believe Christians." "Let us," Muenzer even dared to say, "employ the Bible for that purpose fo which it was given: to kill and t strangle, and not to make alive."[8] On can readily see how this distorted ide of Christ and of Christianity could lea a man of Muenzer's temperament t instigate a fierce and bloody rebellio against all his supposed enemies. Th work of the Wittenberg reformer whom he so bitterly opposed he com plained of in this manner: "Th Bible-scholars (*Schriftgelehrten*) hav robbed Christ's sheep of their rightf voice and they have changed the tru crucified Christ into a purely fantastic deity. They have rejected the pur knowledge (*Kunst*) of God and hav set up in its place a pretty golden id (*Herrgott*)." Wherever one looks Muenzer's writings he finds this sam emphasis: "One must endure the plow share of Christ . . . One must posses the whole Christ, not just half of Hi Whoever will not receive the bitt Christ, will gorge himself to death o honey." This concept of a bitter Chri led Muenzer to disaster. Luther w rightfully able to rebut it by showin that the wrathful, bitter Christ, wh comes as Judge, ought to provoke sin ners to humility and heart-searchin prayer, and not to violence or insurre tion. But to see himself as a miserabl sinner in the true biblical sense was . insight which Muenzer evidently nev had.

6. In his book, *Von dem getichten glawben auff nechst protestation aussgangenn*, 1524, quoted by Strobel, *op. cit.*, pp. 156, 200

7. The word Muenzer uses is *vergoettert*, in his book, *Thomas Muenzer mit dem Hammer*, 1524, cited by Strobel, *op. cit.* p. 159.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 156: "Zu toedten und zu wuerge und nicht lebendig zu machen."

A Program for Christian Social Action

The Christian Labor Association recently published "Pioneering Towards A Christian Society," *a noteworthy attempt at stating some specific aims for a Christian social movement. We print some excerpts of interest below.*

The CLA maintains a separate, independent organization because it is convinced that in this way its program for Christian social justice, as outlined below, can most effectively be worked out. First, by remaining independent and separate, it is in a better position to give concrete realization to its ideals. Secondly, it can act as a challenge to present-day secular ideals and methods of organization in labor. Thirdly, it can educate its own members through practice and indoctrination in the meaning of Christianity for this important realm of life, and build up a dedicated corps of workingmen possessing the know-how and intelligence needed for the building of a Christian social order. By such means it can offer to American society, by word and example, through criticism and suggestion, a series of constructive approaches to the problems of our complex technological civilization — approaches based on the Christian dynamic. . . .

The role of labor unions. The labor unions emerged as a response to the tragic conditions produced by the Industrial Revolution. They were able, in the face of fierce opposition from business men, to give the workingman a decent wage and decent living conditions. They were able to put the workingman on an equal footing of power with the business man. The AFL and CIO (and earlier unions) have don outstanding work; but it has been wit in the framework of a secular socie The labor unions (apart from the Chri tian unions in Europe) accepted m terialism as the basis for social life, did the employers against whom th bravely struggled. They promoted, did the employers, the welfare of a sp cial class against another class. Th failed, as did the employers, to dir a real critique against the sickness modern society. Their potential w limited from the start by their acce ance of the basic presuppositions Liberalism (or of the Modern Mind

Hence, once the worker was succes fully integrated and "adjusted" to L eral society, once his material nee were met, once he had been given equal place at the "great barbecue," t

AFL and CIO could do little more for him; they could not give an effective critique of more fundamental dangers and dislocations, nor could they begin to develop new social institutions which would lead towards a better social order. Thus it is that the CIO and AFL are already suffering from "middle age," hardening of the arteries, and a "porkchop beaurocracy"; they have explored all the frontiers they are equipped to explore. The hope of further advance for the workingman lies, it seems to us, in pioneering organizations such as the CLA.

In brief, while labor unions were a necessary answer to the *laissez-faire* capitalism of the Industrial Revolution in the nineteenth century, labor unions like the CIO and AFL are not a sufficient answer to the real problems of the workingman. This is especially true from the point of view of the Christian workingman, who is concerned with much more than a decent pay check. From his point of view, both the secular business man and the secular union leader have limited horizons; both, essentially, worship Mammon rather than God; both miss the vision of a Christian social order and the need for pioneering towards this goal. The Christian worker who is concerned with such pioneering cannot be satisfied with the CIO and AFL. . . .

It is only within a social-economic system which fundamentally reflects the idea of co-operation rather than competition that the conflicting claims and differing interests which are always present in human life can be properly controlled and channelized for good. Therefore, the idea of co-operation, if it is to be effectively realized, presupposes and demands a gradual transformation of the present social order and the gradual building of a better, freer, more equitable social order, by means of social forms and structures based on the Word of God. . . .

The idea of co-operation demands that the worker be able to live and work in creative participation in his job with his fellow-workers. The Industrial Revolution of the early nineteenth century shattered the old social forms such as the medieval guilds, which took this aspect of work into account. It has seriously undermined the old organic human ties based on familiarity and friendship, and replaced these by a cold, impersonal system based on cash relations. The worker is viewed not as God's image-bearer, but as a unit of production. The worker sees his work not as something done for God, to contribute to His glory, but rather as a meaningless round of chores. The worker has therefore become spiritually pauperized, and estranged from the real meaning of his work. His work has therefore become drudgery, no matter how high the rate of pay. It should be noted that this is not primarily the fault of technology, but rather the fault of secular Liberalism, which has failed to find (or even seriously to search for) new social forms adequate to meet the problems raised by technology. . . .

A basic minimum standard of living must be achieved and maintained for all members of society. Technology makes this both possible and necessary. "The laborer is worthy of his hire," and entitled to those things which will enable him to maintain himself and his family with honesty and integrity.

Full employment is a moral and social imperative. There is nothing which eats away at the confidence, the hope, and the sense of responsibility of the worker as the recurring threat of unemployment. Involuntary unemployment undermines the very fabric of society, and is a sin against society and against God.

An annual wage system for workers should be used whenever possible. This would give the worker greater security, and would also help avoid cyclical unemployment. The CLA, here as with other proposals which harmonize with Christian principles, is glad to co-operate with other unions in reaching this specific goal.

Family allowances for workers should be considered. The present system tends to discourage having children, and thus tends to undermine family life, the basis of society.

Tariff policy should be regulated so that not only our own country but also other countries benefit as far as is possible. The CLA protests against any tariff policy which is dictated by sinful selfishness rather than by a consciousness of our obligation to share the blessings of our resources and technical progress with other nations and peoples. Our nation, and every nation, has the obligation to work in the direction of sharing the riches of God's creation for the benefit of all mankind.

Racial discrimination in the economic sphere is condemned by the CLA as contrary to Christ's command that we love our neighbor. While many practical problems are involved, it must be realized that economic discrimination because of race is contrary to the Christian demand for social justice, and conflicts with Scriptural teaching. . . .

The CLA favors co-partnership (Mitbestimmungsrecht) as a goal of primary importance in building a more Christian social order. It favors the building of economic institutions such that the worker as well as the employer may share in the adventure of production.

The ultimate goal of the CLA is the participation of the workers as partners in industry; literally, co-operation in industry. This means a share in profits, management and ownership of industry. These three areas of partnership reinforce and actually imply each other. The organic development of such co-partnership is possible to the extent that both worker and employer are animated by a vision of what such co-operation would mean.

Profit-sharing and worker-stockholders are immediately attainable goals. Workers sharing in management and in the decisions of the board of directors implies that workers be trained in economics, sociology, law, and similar subjects; and this implies trade schools of a more advanced nature than are so far common. . . .

As soon as possible, workers should receive representation in management and ownership, so that they may take part in decisions which affect their own welfare. This representation should be sufficiently large to elicit the respect and co-operation of management and shareholders. Eventually each industry must be a partnership, so that the worker too will be an integral part of the industrial process, and feel a responsibility towards it. This sense of responsibility is a necessary prerequisite towards restoring spiritual meaning to work.

In the Christian conception of society, both owners and employees are stewards of God's gifts, which in industry should be pooled for the benefit of all.

The CLA presents an opportunity for Christian pioneers. It gives the Christian worker a chance to share in exploring social frontiers, enlisted with others under a Christian banner. This is both more effective and more satisfying than remaining simply a member of labor unions such as the CIO and AFL, which, however, admirable, can hardly strive towards a Christian social

A Program for Christian Social Action — Continued

order, and can hardly carry out the demands of a Christian idea of social justice which goes beyond selfish class interests to the more fundamental needs of a nation in crisis.

The complete pamphlet may be obtained from the CLA, 1600 Buchanan St. S.W., Grand Rapids, Michigan. We invite comments from our readers on the CLA program, whether pro or con.

LETTERS TO THE JOURNAL

The Catechism's "Original"

In the June number of this Journal appears a letter by the Reverend Anthony A. Hoekema, a letter in which my name occurs and to which the editorial committee gives me opportunity to reply.

Rev. Hoekema's letter takes up two matters. More than half the space it occupies on the page is given to a plea for "an accurate, annotated version" of the Heidelberg Catechism. This part of his letter we pass by without comment.

The rest of Rev. Hoekema's letter goes back to an expression that occurred in an earlier article submitted by me (entitled "The 'Absolute' Antithesis," June issue) which he considers "an error." (I had written in dealing with the passage in the Heidelberg Catechism that says that men are prone by nature to hate God that "the original Latin has *propensus sum*.") To this part of Rev. Hoekema's letter I should like to reply.

There can be no doubt that the Heidelberg Catechism was first printed in the German language. In fact there were three German printings in the early weeks of 1563. The Preface to the first of these bears the date January 17. And after that, but in any case not later than April 3 of 1563, a Latin version appeared. On the basis of this chronology Rev. Hoekema makes bold to call the Latin a "translation" of the earlier German.

At this point, the crucial point, Rev. Hoekema's argument is poorly documented. His sole authority is a preface to a now pretty well antiquated volume (published in 1863. The monumental work by the younger Bakhuizen Van Den Brink on "De Nederlandsche Belijdenisgeschrifts" published in 1940 has rendered all earlier works outdated) which he repeats uncritically. It may indeed be that the Latin version was actually "a translation" but we shall have to produce better arguments that this is so to establish it as a fact.

What is the actual situation, the known facts? In his *Vorred* (Preface) to the first German printing, dated January 17, 1563 as we said, Duke Frederik upon whose orders the Catechism had been drawn up declares that he with the collaboration of the Theological Faculty has "*einen Summarischen vnderricht oder Catechismum vnserer Christlichen Religion . . . beides in Deutscher vnd Lateinischer Sprach verfassen vnd stellen lassen*" (has ordered a summary statement or Catechism of our Christian religion to be drawn up and composed in both languages, German and Latin). And the energetic Frederik adds that he has given these instruction for two reasons, namely, 1) in order that the youth may be instructed in sound Christian doctrine, 2) in order that preachers and teachers may have a certain and fixed doctrinal statement to bind themselves to in their labors.

From this passage in the *Vorred* we see that not an eventual Latin translation was in Frederik's mind but a parallel and complementary Latin version. Why then was the German version put to press first? Probably because it was felt that the reason listed by Frederik as the *first* reason was also the most pressing. (How great the need for a text to be used in catechizing the youth actually was may be gathered from the fact that within ten weeks of the original printing a third issue was already on the presses.)

We may safely assume that all the while the Latin version was also being readied for publication. It was no doubt intended to serve the *second* of the needs vizualized by Frederik, the need for a normative handbook for teachers and preachers. This would explain why it appeared in Latin, the language of scholarship; also why it has *numbered* questions and *verse* references in the proof texts.

Nor was the Latin version (prepared, as Rev. Hoekema correctly states, by Joshua Lagus Pomeranus and Lambert Ludolf Kuiper, or Pithopoeus in the latinized version of his name. The men were brothers-in-law; and the latter after his wife had died married the widow of Ursinus.) sent into the world as a translation; the title reads "*Catechesis religionis Christianae, qua traditur in Ecclesiis et Scholis Palatinatus*

It is significant that the Latin version was from the outset taken to be the version of authority. From it translations were made into other tongues, i to the Dutch for instance. (It is tru an earlier Dutch translation did occu one that was made from the Germa version, but it soon lost out. This ti in with tensions that existed all alon the front in those decades.) To men went back when they wanted purge the Catechism of the many i accuracies that had crept in; in 15 for example, Caspar Vander Heid came out with such a corrected editi and he says roundly that he has tak the Latin of 1563 as his norm. fact it is not too much to say that ev since the appearance of the Latin ve sion of 1563 the earlier German ve sions might as well never have exist in cultured circles. Doedes, one of t best informed authorities in this fie speaking of the Dutch translation 1563 declares bluntly that "*een Duitsc tekst waarmede deze Hollandsche ov eenkompt, heeft nooit bestaan*" (a Ge man text with which this Dutch versi agrees there never was).

We leave it to the reader, and Rev. Hoekema in his second thoug whether we wrote "an error" when wrote of the words "prone by natu etc." that "the original Latin h *propensus sum*," the original fr which by common consent our Engli version stems.

And we leave it to all competen students to decide whether it is m better to speak of the Latin of Apr 1563 as a parallel version rather th to call it bluntly a "translation."

Leonard Verduin,
Ann Arbor, Michig

P.S. The only warrant there seems be for calling the Latin version a tra lation of the German is that it also h the famous 80th Question which show up for the first time in the third G man printing. And we deem th "warrant" to be no warrant at all. T two printings are so close to ea other in time and the *expedieurs* we so intimate with each other that it better to consider the insertion Q. 80 parallel rather than consecuti incidents.